```
1
   ERSKINE & TULLEY
   A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
   MICHAEL J. CARROLL (St. Bar #50246)
   220 Sansome Street, Suite 600 San Francisco, CA 94104
3
   Telephone: (415) 392-5431
4
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
5
6
 7
8
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
                      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
   NORTHWEST ADMINISTRATORS, INC.,
                                        ) NO. C 04 3481 FMS
12
                        Plaintiff,
13
                                            ORDER AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT
              VS.
14
   A D AUTOMOTIVE, etc.,
15
                        Defendant.
16
17
              Good cause appearing therefor, it is hereby ORDERED that
18
   default judgment be entered in favor of plaintiff, NORTHWEST
19
   ADMINISTRATORS, INC., against defendant, A D AUTOMOTIVE DISTRIBUTORS,
20
   INC., a California corporation, as follows:
21
              1.
                   Principal
                                               $ 4,126.06
22
              2..
                                                    94.64
                  Interest
23
              3.
                  Attorneys fees
                                                   720.00
24
              4.
                   Costs
                                                   450.00
25
                        TOTAL:
                                               $ 5,390.70
26
              IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED in light of the decision
27
   in International Union of Operating Engineers v. Richard D. Karr, No.
28
   91-35846 (9th Cir. 1993), that the only issue raised in this
```

1

(Proposed) ORDER AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT

Cascase03:04-03433481MSMSDocumentr2022 Fileed103503502055Page2020f2

proceeding through the date of this default judgment is the failure of defendant to pay known delinquent contributions for the months of June through December 2004 based upon unaudited financial information. The Court allows plaintiff to reserve its right to audit the defendant employer for any periods not previously audited, including the time period referred to above. Entry of the Judgment has no effect whatsoever on either (a) plaintiff's right to audit defendant and collect by subsequent legal action any sum found thereby to be due, or (b) plaintiff's right to collect by subsequent legal action any sums found to be due for any time period other than the one referred to above.

Date: June 16, 2005

14 Judge Fern M. Smith